



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/501,035	02/09/2000	Shulong Li	2082B	3328
25280	7590	02/14/2012		
Legal Department (M-495)			EXAMINER	
P.O. Box 1926			THOMPSON, CAMIE S	
Spartanburg, SC 29304				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1786	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/14/2012 PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/501,035

**Applicant(s)**

LI, SHULONG

**Examiner**

CAMIE THOMPSON

**Art Unit**

1786

**Period for Reply** -- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Amendment filed 11/23/2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on \_\_\_\_; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 20-22, 25-29 and 32-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 20-22, 25-29 and 32-35 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Applicant's amendment and accompanying remarks filed November 23, 2011 are acknowledged.
2. Examiner acknowledges amended claim 25.
3. Examiner acknowledges cancelled claims 1-19, 23-24 and 30.
4. The rejection of claims 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph is overcome by applicant's amendment.
5. The rejection of claims 24-26 and 30 under 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph is overcome by applicant's amendment.
6. The rejection of claims 20-22, 24-26 and 34-35 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Veiga et al., U.S. Pre Grant Publication 2002/0022420 is withdrawn due to applicant's argument.
7. The rejection of claims 27-33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veiga et al., U.S. Pre Grant Publication 2002/0022420 in view of Kami et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,114,180 is withdrawn due to applicant's argument.

***Claim Objections***

8. Claim 35 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 35 is objected to because the status identifier is incorrect. Claim 35 is amended. The status identifier for claim 35 should read - - Currently amended - -. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

9. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 31 is rendered indefinite because it is dependent upon a cancelled claim,  
24.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 20-22, 25-29 and 31-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kami et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,114,180.

Kami discloses a woven air bag having a coating film applied thereon wherein the coating can be on opposite sides of the fabric (see abstract and Example Group I). Column 6, lines 17-19 discloses that the coating film can be a polyurethane rubber. Example 7 of the Kami reference discloses that the woven fabric is Jacquard woven. It is disclosed in column 11, lines 14-18 that the coating films can be on the interior of the fabric of the airbag. Example Group I discloses that the coating film has a weight of 100 g/m<sup>2</sup>, which is a weight of 3.0 ounces/square yard as per instant claim 25. The present claims do not provide for the second coating to be present on the first coating. When the coating films are on the interior of the fabric (A) and (B), the second

coating can be on the first coating and the first coating would be closer to the fabric. The Kami reference does not disclose the coating of the first layer. Present claim 21 is very broad as to the coating layers. The reference does disclose the total weight of the coating that is on the fabric. The coating adds weight to the airbag providing it with increased strength. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have a first layer coating of 0.3-2.5 ounces/square yard in order to provide increased strength to the air bag. Claims 21 and 22 include treatments to the airbag. Claims 21 and 22 do not further limit the structure or components of the airbag. The limitations of claims 21 and 22 are not given any patentable weight.

### ***Response to Arguments***

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to the present claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CAMIE THOMPSON whose telephone number is (571)272-1530. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00 am - 6:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jennifer Chriss can be reached on 571-272-7783. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/CAMIE THOMPSON/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1786